

**RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111**  
**U.S. APP. NO. 10/751,469**

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-6 are pending in the application.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ueunten (US Patent No. 5,412,309)

Claims 2, 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Ueunten in view of Fenk (US Patent No. 4,369,410).

Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Ueunten in view of Fenk and further in view of Mullins et al (US Patent No. 5,592,124).

**Analysis of the Claim Rejections**

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner cites portions of Ueunten as teaching each of the claimed features. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's analysis of claim 1 in at least one regard. That is, the Examiner cites transistors Q4 to Q7 of Fig. 8 of Ueunten as teaching a bias circuit part "for mirroring the differential current [output current of M1, M2], inverting the differential current, and producing an inverted differential current." (Office Action, top of page 3.) Applicant submits, however, that the transistors Q4 to Q7 would not produce an inverted current of the current in transistors M1 and M2.

Ueunten does not anticipate claim 1 at least because Ueunten fails to disclose the "bias circuit part for mirroring the differential current, inverting the differential current, and producing an inverted differential current", as required by claim 1.

**RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111**  
**U.S. APP. NO. 10/751,469**

In rejecting claims 2, 5 and 6 as being unpatentable over Ueunten and Fenk, while analyzing claim 2, the Examiner concedes that Ueunten does not disclose a second differentiation circuit. The Examiner, however, cites Fenk as disclosing such a circuit and concludes that it would have been obvious to incorporate the differential circuit of Fenk into the input differential circuit of Ueunten to provide “first and second pair amplifier input circuit with a common reference voltage.” It is not clear, however, how such a pair of amplifiers would be applied to Ueunten. Modifying Ueunten to incorporate such a circuit is not taught or suggested by either reference. Such modification would require extensive changes to the circuitry of Ueunten, and it is not apparent how these changes would be made. At least for this reason, Applicant submits that the rejection is improper.

Further, Applicant submits that claim 2, as well as claims 5 and 6 which depend therefrom, are patentable because Ueunten and Fenk alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest “a bias circuit part for ... producing an inverted differential current”, as recited in claim 1. See the discussion of claim 1 above where it was discussed that Ueunten does not disclose this feature.

Regarding claims 3 and 4, Applicant submits that Mullins et al does not make up for the deficiencies Ueunten and Fenk in teaching or suggesting the “bias circuit part for ... producing an inverted differential current.”

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

**RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111**  
**U.S. APP. NO. 10/751,469**

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Peter A. McKenna  
Registration No. 38,551

Date: December 8, 2005